

**REMARKS**

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Final Office Action dated November 29, 2006. This amendment is timely filed.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 41-65, 69-73, 75-77, 79-87 and 89-95 were pending. In the Office Action, the disclosure was objected to for failing to include the appropriate section headings. The drawings were objected to for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claims 54, 55, 58, 60-62, 64, 65, 69-73 and 75-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 41, 42, 44, 45, 47-53, 56, 57, 80, 81-87 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 43, 59, 63 and 89-94 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 46, 77 and 79 were allowed. The objections and rejections are discussed in more detail below.

**I. Objection to the Specification**

In the Office Action, an objection was raised to the specification because it lacked section headings. Amendments are made herein to add appropriate section headings to the specification, using the paragraph numbering of the published application. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

**II. Objections to the Drawings**

In the Office Action, an objection was raised to the drawings for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants submit a replacement drawing herewith, including an amended Figure 15 which includes the smart chip 14A, and which is believed to overcome this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. Rejections on Art and Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 54, 55, 58, 60-62, 64, 65, 69-73, 75 and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,078,265 to Bonder et al. ("Bonder"). Claims 41, 42, 44,

Application No. 09/764,729

Docket No. 9300-1

Reply to Final Office Action dated November 29, 2006

45, 47-50, 52, 53, 80-87 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,757 to Spaln ("Spaln"). Claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonder in view of Spaln and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,947,662 to Imedio. Claims 56 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonder in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,055,658 to Cockburn.

Claims 43, 59, 63 and 89-94 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 46, 77 and 79 have been allowed.

Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 43 has been incorporated into claim 41 herein, which is thus believed to be allowable. The subject matter of claim 59 has been incorporated into claim 54, which is also believed to be allowable. Claim 63 has been rewritten in independent form. Thus, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Applicant has made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is thus believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-19-06



Mark D. Passler

Registration No. 40,764

**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Tel: 561-653-5000

Docket No. 9300-1

{WP357413;1}